

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 9, and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 14 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1, 4-8, 10-16, and 18-21 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 7, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerre, Weiser, and Chakrabarti. Doerre teaches generating a content taxonomy of electronic documents. Weiser teaches integrating a headerless apparatus into a messaging environment. Chakrabarti teaches a web crawler that includes a topic-specific library for user search.

However, Doerre, Weiser, and Chakrabarti, neither separately nor in combination teach or disclose recognizing two or more concepts,

“wherein recognizing said two or more concepts includes for each of said two or more concepts:”

identifying a plurality of features in said document, wherein said plurality of features represents evidence of one of said two or more concepts in said document;

calculating a concept weight for one of said two or more concepts using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features, wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts, and wherein the recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts is calculated for each paragraph in the document; and

comparing said concept weight with a predetermined threshold value.”

as amended claims 1, 7, and 14 now recite. Support for the amendments can be found without limitation on page 15, lines 28-31 of the specification.

The Examiner mentions Russell-Falla in conjunction with claim 3 that has now been amended into claim 1. Russell-Falla teaches blocking the display of a web page (or other digital record) from a search engine link that contains a particular type of content. Russell-Falla’s teachings focus on a single dimension “good” vs. “bad” for a web page specifically with regard

to content that may be offensive. However, Russell-Falla neither teaches nor discloses recognizing two or more concepts,

“wherein recognizing said two or more concepts includes for each of said two or more concepts:”

identifying a plurality of features in said document, wherein said plurality of features represents evidence of one of said two or more concepts in said document;

calculating a concept weight for one of said two or more concepts using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features, wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts, and wherein the recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts is calculated for each paragraph in the document; and

comparing said concept weight with a predetermined threshold value.”

It is therefore believed that claims 1, 7, and 14 are allowable. Claims 4-6, 8, 10-13, and 15-16, and 18-21 depend from claims 1, 7, and 14 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 5/16/2008

Terrence L. Wong
Registration No. 55,741
V 408-973-2578
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014